DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 673 SO 009 446

AUTHOR	Downey, L. W.; And Others
TITLE	The Social Studies in Alberta--1975: A Summary of a Report of an Assessment.
SPONS AGENCY	Alberta Dept. of Education, Edmonton.
PUB DATE	Dec 75
NOTE	38p.; For a related document, see SO 009 445
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Classroom Observation Techniques; Classroom Research; Comparative Education; *Curriculum Evaluation; *Educational Assessment; Educational Improvement; Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; Followup Studies; Foreign Countries; Formative Evaluation; Program Descriptions; Program Development; Public Schools; Question Answer Interviews; *Social Studies; Social Studies Units; State Departments of Education; *Summative Evaluation; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Alberta

ABSTRACT

This summary report assesses the design implementation and classroom instruction of the Alberta, Canada, social studies curriculum. The purpose of the study was to present a synthesis of findings from five investigative activities undertaken by a research association in Alberta: (1) review of the background of the program, (2) critiques of the master plan, (3) questionnaire survey of teachers, students, and parents, (4) analysis of locally developed programs, and (5) series of interviews, observations, and site visits. The study is presented in four chapters. Chapter I, The Questions, asks how appropriate and effective are the original master plan, the programs which have been developed at the local level, and the typical classroom situation. Chapter II, Summary of Conclusions and Supporting Evidence, broadly generalizes conclusions for the master plan, program development, and the classroom situation. Chapter III, Summary Judgments, presents a profile of attainment of educational objectives in the three sectors of the curriculum, and Chapter IV, Recommendations, suggests nine specific steps which might improve the project. It is concluded that the social studies program is consistent with emerging objectives of education but is not being effectively implemented. (Author/DB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

THE SOCIAL STUDIES IN ALBERTA -- 1975

A REPORT OF AN ASSESSMENT

Submitted to:

The Department of Education
The Government of Alberta

Prepared by:

L.W. Downey Research Associates Ltd.
Edmonton, Alberta

THE SOCIAL STUDIES IN ALBERTA -- 1975

A REPORT OF AN ASSESSMENT

FOREWORD

In January, 1974, we submitted to the Department of Education a report entitled Social Studies in Alberta: Prospects for Evaluation, which was both a report of a preliminary study and a plan for a follow-up, in-depth evaluation of the status of the "new" Social Studies program in Alberta.

That plan, along with some guidelines provided by the Department of Education Social Studies Evaluation Committee, became the terms of reference of the inquiry reported in this document.

The terms of reference mandated that the study be: (1) descriptive -- to describe the nature of operating programs; (2) comparative -- to verify the congruence or lack thereof between the intended curriculum and the real; (3) normative -- to determine the appropriateness of the program in terms of the Goals of Basic Education; (4) exploratory -- to determine the factors related to successes and failures; and (5) interpretive -- to generate recommendations as to how the program might achieve optimal success. We have attempted to follow this mandate.

To provide for ease of reading and/or selective reading, the report is presented as a Summary Report and five Appendices covering our major activities.

The report is presented to the Department of Education in the hope that it may assist in determining future policies and actions.

L. W. DOWNEY
August, 1975

THE SOCIAL STUDIES IN ALBERTA -- 1975

A REPORT OF AN ASSESSMENT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This evaluation study was planned and conducted in the mode of a "research mission". That is to say, the research was divided into a series of sub-projects, each of which was staffed by a group of researchers and appropriate support personnel. Hence, a large number of agencies and a larger number of individuals contributed to this study in various ways.

1. The study was planned and coordinated by a small group who came to be known as the Directorate. Members of that group participated in various phases of the study and assumed final responsibility for the Summary Report -- including the recommendations. Members of the Directorate were:

T. Aoki
H. Baker
L. Downey
D. Massey

2. The two essay reviews (Appendix B.1 and 2), critiques of the documents in which the Master Plan of the program is articulated, were prepared by:

C. Chamberlin & T. Aoki & W. Werner

3. The statistical analyses of the questionnaire survey data and the report of that phase of the study (Appendix C) were completed by:

R. Jackson and B. Downey

4. The document analyses were conducted by a large number of research assistants (named in Appendix D) and reported by:

T. Aoki and D. Massey

5. Site vists were conducted by four teams (named in Appendix E). Their reports were "put together" by:

H.S. Baker

6. The distribution of questionnaires to the random samples of teachers, students and parents was undertaken by the Social Studies Specialist Council of the Alberta Teachers' Association.

7. Local school authorities that participated in the site visit phase of the study were:

Calgary Public School Board
County of Lac Ste. Anne
County of Ponoka
County of Red Deer
Edmonton Public School Board
Edmonton Separate School Board
Foothills School Division
Medicine Hat Public School District
Medicine Hat Separate School District

8. Senior Research Associates, involved in the total project, were:

B. Connors
J. Downey
R. Jackson
W. Werner
D. Wilson
I. Wright

9. Individual scholars who served as consultants to various aspects of the project included:

W. Badger
C. Chamberlin
F. Crowther
G. Deleeuw
P. Holt
D. Ledgerwood
E. Moore
E. Olstad
F. Simon
H. Sherk
H. Skolrood
H. Toews
G. Torgunrud
R. Wray

10. The Social Studies Evaluation Committee of the Department of Education provided guidance throughout the project.

To all of the above individuals and agencies (and any whom we may have inadvertently failed to mention), we express appreciation.

T. Aoki
H. Baker
L. Downey
D. Massey

THE SOCIAL STUDIES IN ALBERTA --1975

A REPORT OF AN ASSESSMENT

CONTENTS

Foreword ..... i.

Acknowledgements ..... ii.

A SUMMARY REPORT ..... 1.

I. The Questions ..... 2.

II. Summary of Conclusions and Supporting Evidence ..... 3.

A. Conclusions Regarding the Master Plan ..... 3.
B. Conclusions Regarding Program Development ..... 8.
C. Conclusions Regarding the School/Classroom Situation ..... 12.

III. Summary Judgments ..... 20.

IV. Recommendations ..... 22.

A. Recommendations Re. The Master Plan ..... 23.
B. Recommendations Re. Program Development ..... 24.
C. Recommendations Re. The School/Classroom Situation ..... 25.
D. Miscellaneous Suggestions ..... 26.

A Concluding Thought ..... 29.

APPENDIX A - Background of the Study ..... 31.

APPENDIX B - Critiques of the Master Plan

1. A Critique of the 1971 Elementary Social Studies Curriculum ..... 43.
2. An Analysis of the 1971 Secondary Social Studies Curriculum ..... 66.

APPENDIX C - Questionnaire Survey of Teachers, Students and Parents ..... 88.

APPENDIX D - Analysis and Assessment of Instructional Programs ..... 169.

APPENDIX E - The Site Visits -- Interviews and Observations ..... 255.

THE SOCIAL STUDIES IN ALBERTA -- 1975

A REPORT OF AN ASSESSMENT

A SUMMARY REPORT

Our study of the new Social Studies program in Alberta involved five major activities: (1) a review of the background of the new program and the development of a conceptual system to guide us in its assessment; (2) critiques of the Master Plan of the new program -- the publications of the Department of Education which set forth the philosophy, the orientation, the content and the strategies of the new program; (3) a questionnaire survey of teachers, students, and parents -- to provide attitudinal and descriptive information; (4) an analysis of a sample of locally-developed programs; and (5) a series of interviews, observations and site visits.

The specific, detailed findings of those five activities are presented in Appendices A to E, respectively.

Our object here, in this summary report, is to present the outcomes of the total project. To do this, we synthesize the findings of all five activities into a set of general conclusions and judgments. From these we proceed to develop our recommendations.

But first, let us examine the questions to which we sought answers.

I. THE QUESTIONS

The conceptual system (see Appendix A) which was initially developed to give guidance to this inquiry, generated several orders of questions: questions about the three domains of the assessment -- instruction, implementation, and formative evaluation; questions about the processes of initiating the new Social Studies -- how the Master Plan was developed, how it was translated into programs, and how it was made operational in the classroom; and questions about the products or outcomes -- how appropriate the Master Plan was and how effective in spawning programs, how appropriate and effective locally-developed programs were (are), and how desirable the final outcomes proved to be in terms of student learning.

Because of limited resources, however, it was decided that not all issues could be given the same in-depth treatment. Instead, priority was given to the instructional domain rather than the implementation and formative evaluation domains, and to products rather than to processes.

Hence, our major questions became.

1. How appropriate and effective was the original Master Plan -- particularly the Plan for Instruction?

   (a) Does it embody a philosophy appropriate to the expressed goals of general education in Alberta? Are its basic orientations sound?

   (b) Is it consistent both internally and with current knowledge or theories of learners and learning? Of teachers and teaching? Of innovation and change?

   (c) Has the plan been effectively communicated to the field? Is it understood by teachers? Is it accepted by teachers? Does it serve to guide them properly in program development?

2. How appropriate and effective were (are) the programs that have been developed at the local level?

   (a) Do they reflect the philosophy and the orientations of the Master Plan? If not, why not?

   (b) How and by whom are such plans developed? Do they incorporate student, parent and community interests, as intended?

(c) Is the process of program development given appropriate time, resources, and support services?

(d) Are formative evaluation techniques incorporated into the process of development?

(e) Are programs of equal quality from region to region?

3. How effective and appropriate is the typical school/classroom situation?

(a) What is the current status of installation of the new program? To what extent does the typical classroom situation reflect a fidelity with the Master Plan?

(b) What constraints still stand in the way of more complete and more effective installation of the new program?

(c) What can now be said about the impacts of the new program, in terms of learner outcomes?

Some of these questions, of course, are difficult, perhaps impossible, to answer precisely and unequivocally at this time. For the evidence on some issues is very difficult to uncover; on others, it is not yet all in. Hence, we have formulated our conclusions and judgments in varying degrees of certainty. Where we consider the evidence to be compelling, our conclusions and judgments are unequivocal. Where the evidence is less compelling, our conclusions are more tentative and our judgments less precise.

II. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

Our conclusions are presented here in the form of rather broad generalizations, synthesized from the specific findings reported in the various appendices. Supporting evidence is presented in the form of illustrative data.

A. CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE MASTER PLAN

In our analysis of the Master Plan (see Appendix A) we considered five variables: (1) the appropriateness of its orientation and its fidelity with the expressed goals of education; (2) its internal consistency; (3) the level of teacher

awareness of and familiarity with the Master Plan; (4) its acceptability to teachers, parents, and students; and (5) its perceived utility to teachers.

1. Appropriateness of Orientation and Fidelity with the Goals of Education. The four major documents of the Department of Education (Experiences in Decision Making, Responding to Change, and the Elementary and Secondary Programs of Studies) each emphasizes social reality as the important consideration in program development.

The orientation is expressed as follows: "By actively confronting value issues . . . [students] will deal not only with *what is* but also with *what ought to be* and will have the opportunity to make this world a more desirable place in which to live". We consider this orientation to be most appropriate and forward-looking.

This orientation is significantly different from the academic disciplines orientation of the sixties, which was typified in Bruner's Process of Education. Indeed, it should be noted that the conceptualization created by the architects of Alberta's new program antedates Bruner's call, in 1971, for a moratorium "on matters that have to do with the structure of history, the structure of physics, the nature of mathematical consistency, and deal with it rather in the context of the problems that face us".

This orientation is clearly consistent with the goals of education, as expressed in such official Department of Education documents as the Statement of the Purposes of Elementary Education and The Goals of Basic Education. Also, its stress on individualization, on morality through open inquiry, and on desirable futures is consistent with the orientation recommended in A Choice of Futures: Report of the Commission on Educational Planning.

Our summary conclusions regarding the orientation of the Master Plan are expressed by Chamberlin (Appendix B.1). The Plan is:

> most defensible for its thrust toward involving students in the examination not only of 'what is' but also of 'what ought to be'; for insisting that students confront real problems that involve conflicting values; and for asking that processes and content be selected to develop an understanding of significant social problems. (p. 3)

2. *Level of Internal Consistency.* Though, as we have noted, the Master Plan is thoroughly commendable for its orientation, it has some serious internal inconsistencies which continue to bedevil teachers.

For example, though the guides prescribe that the valuing process end with students acting on their decisions, the retention of traditional topics such as "the historic roots of man" and "comparisons of Alberta with remote regions of the world" is in no way conducive to action.

Also, though heavy emphasis is placed upon the seven steps of the Raths model of valuing, none of the sample units illustrates how this model should serve as the basis of instruction.

There appears to be a further inconsistency in the "knowledge" section of the program in that it emphasizes the importance of interdisciplinary concepts while at the same time advocating unidisciplinary studies.

A fourth perceived inconsistency is in the area of knowledge building. Though teachers are cautioned against asking students to engage in valuing without adequate bases of knowledge, the sample units seem to suggest that students be required to begin predicting consequences before there is any substantial mastery of knowledge.

Finally, though the Master Plan clearly recognizes the importance of "allowing each student to enhance his own personal meaning of humaness", what is uniquely "human" tends to get standardized in Raths' seven criteria.

3. *Teacher Awareness and Familiarity.* Though most teachers seem aware of the major thrusts of the new program, and though most are aware of the existence of a Master Plan, most are not thoroughly familiar with the substance of the major documents. Specifically, though over 90% of the respondents to our questionnaire claimed to be aware of Responding to Change and/or Experiences in Decision Making, it became evident in our interviews that they differ widely in their knowledge of these documents. It was further evident from our document analyses that, though most teacher-program developers were familiar with the major thrusts of the Master Plan, many of the more subtle orientations (for example, the treatment of concepts) tended to escape them.

In general, we concluded that a great many teachers do not have the deep familiarity with the Master Plan that would be required for effective implementation.

4. *Acceptability of the Master Plan.* There appears to be reasonable support for most of the orientations of the program among teachers, parents, and students.

For example, 61% of the students, 55% of the parents, and 74% of the teachers support the program for its *focus upon the examination of societal goals.* Similarly, 59% of the students, 79% of the parents, and 90% of the teachers support the program for its *emphasis upon consequences of human behavior.* Over 90% of the students, 89% of the parents, and 81% of the teachers support the program for its concern with *controversial issues.* And 53% of the students, 76% of the parents, and 82% of the teachers approved the idea that *society's policies and leaders be challenged in the classroom.*

It should be noted, however, that despite the general support given to the specific ideas indicated above, a full 32% of our teacher respondents rejected the new program for its *general emphasis on values.*

5. *Teacher Perceptions of Utility.* Teachers varied widely in their perceptions as to the real utility of the major documents. Although most teachers responding to our questionnaire claimed familiarity with the major documents Responding to Change and Experiences in Decision Making, they appeared to be neither strongly negative nor strongly enthusiastic as to their usefulness, ease of understanding, organization, clarity and pedagogical value. (Appendix C.) Similarly, though the Programs of Studies were said to be available, most teachers were again neither strongly enthusiastic nor strongly negative about their usefulness.

From our interviews we learned that most teachers are appreciative of the content of the handbooks -- but for a variety of reasons. Some perceive them to be useful in providing the general orientation toward *valuing and inquiry;* others perceive their usefulness to be in the *content direction* they provide; still others value the guidance the handbooks provide for *lesson planning.*

Some evidence of lack of utility (or perhaps, comprehension) of the Master Plan was found in our document analysis. For example, although the Plan suggests that concepts be developed *by rules*, teacher-developed units indicate that concept development is predominantly *by example* and *by topic.*

In summary, we conclude that, although the Master Plan is highly commendable and highly acceptable in its major orientations, its internal inconsistencies and a lack of teacher awareness of its subtle intents have rendered it far less useful than it ought to have been. Indeed, we conclude that the Master Plan is still, five years after its creation, far more an idea in the minds of its creators than it is a guide to Social Studies education in the classrooms of the Province.

B. CONCLUSIONS REGARDING PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

In our analyses of the processes and products of program development, we examined six major indicators of quality: (1) fidelity with the Master Plan -- in the matters of value concepts, the Designative-Appraisive-Prescriptive (D.A.P.) orientation and the treatment of skills; (2) adequacy of time and resources; (3) level of support; (4) adequacy of formative evaluation techniques; (5) differences among regions; and (5) adequacy of Canadian content.

1. Fidelity with the Master Plan. Although the units focusing on value issues tend to be isolated portions of instructional programs, such value concepts as are dealt with appear to have a high level of fidelity with the value concepts recommended in the Master Plan documents. Specifically, in 92% of the units analyzed, the value concepts incorporated into the programs matched those specified in the Master Plan. However, the evidence also suggests that value concepts tend to get developed largely by topic, only slightly by example, and almost never by rule.

The so-called D.A.P. orientation of the Social Studies program prescribes that an appropriate balance be struck between the designative, the appraisive and the prescriptive modes. In the designative mode, emphasis is on *what is, what was,* or *what will be* and the major stress is upon the traditional academic disciplines; in the appraisive mode, emphasis is on *what should be* and the major stress is upon issues or problems having interdisciplinary bases; and in the prescriptive mode, emphasis is upon *what should be done* and the major stress is upon the formulation of appropriate courses of personal action. In our analyses of programs, we found the major emphasis (80%) to be on the designative, a very minor emphasis (20%) on the appraisive, and no orientation whatsoever toward the prescriptive.

The skills incorporated into teacher-developed programs also reflect a high degree (100%) of fidelity with the Master Plan. But the skills which are emphasized are typically lower-order skills -- recall, map reading, etc., to the exclusion of essential valuing skills of comparison, of dialogue, of understanding and appreciation, and of compromise.

2. *Time and Resources.* The Master Plan calls for extensive involvement of teachers, students and community in the processes of local program development. Yet the time and resources allowed for teachers to engage in this activity are generally minimal.

A full 92% of the teachers polled indicated that they needed time for program development; only 22% indicated that they were given such necessary time.

Over 75% of the teachers agreed with the proposition that students should be involved in program development; but just over 40% viewed this as a possibility -- because of time constraints.

The plight of the Elementary teacher in the matter of program development appears to be a special case. The Elementary teacher is a generalist; she/he teaches many, if not all, subjects; hence, the burden of program development in the Social Studies appears to be particularly onerous at this level.

3. *Level of Support.* Teachers, in general, are not at all enthusiastic about the kinds of encouragement and assistance they received (or now receive) in the task of program development.

Most (73%) view other teachers as their best source of assistance. Some (44%) consider supervisors and consultants to be helpful. Few (36%) think their principals are supportive and still fewer (29%) perceive teachers' associations as helpful.

In retrospect, most teachers rank the Department of Education as being most helpful to them in implementing the new program, the local school board as being of second most help, the teachers' association as being third, and the universities as fourth.

Finally, though teachers believe that the Department of Education's consultants could and should be of considerable assistance, their potential is largely lost through their efforts to be, at once, both assistants and evaluators.

4. *Formative Evaluation*: Until now, no real formative evaluation of the program has taken place. The evaluation materials produced during the pilot-testing phase of the new programs were not made available to teachers (and, indeed, now appear to have been "lost"). Individual teachers who are attempting either to conduct formative evaluations of their own programs or more summative evaluations of their students' progress are at a total loss to know what the criteria or the norms ought to be. Hence, the norm has become either *traditional evaluation of traditional content* or *no evaluation at all.*

5. *Regional Differences.* A very wide discrepancy appears to exist between the quantity and quality of materials available to students and teachers in urban areas and those available in rural areas. In most urban areas, the materials for program development are fairly adequate; in most rural areas the materials are quite inadequate.

Similarly, consultative and support services appear to be quite adequate in urban areas, but quite inadequate in rural areas.

Not surprisingly, therefore, the level of program implementation (as revealed in teacher-developed programs) varies markedly from region to region.

6. *Canadian Content.* In the prescribed program, there are provisions for Canadian content. However, these provisions are unevenly distributed. While most of the Elementary program (grades 1-5) and the Senior High program (Social Studies 10, 20 and 30) do specify topics and themes which deal in Canadian content, the content at both the grade 6 and the Junior High School levels is completely devoid of Canadian materials.

Fully 82% of the teachers polled, 79% of the parents, and 65% of the students believe that the Canadian content of the Social Studies should be increased -- and perhaps, by inference, more evenly distributed across the grades.

It should also be noted, however, that most parents, students and teachers would deplore an emphasis on "Canadiana" which would become chauvinistic or nationalistic. Instead, they would favor an emphasis which would make Canada the base, the starting-point for the consideration of all issues -- be they world-wide or Canada-specific.

In summary, we conclude that there has been considerable slippage in the translation of the Master Plan into programs. Concepts are still developed in traditional ways -- largely by topic and in unidisciplinary ways, not by rule; the emphasis is still upon the "designative", at the expense of the "appraisive" and the "prescriptive"; and lower-level skills of inquiry still take precedence over the higher level skills of value inquiry. We further conclude that some of the reasons for this slippage are: lack of time for program development, lack of resources, lack of consultative services, and lack of teacher competence in program development.

C. CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE SCHOOL/CLASSROOM SITUATION

In our attempt to assess the appropriateness and effectiveness of the real classroom situation, we asked three questions: (1) How fully and faithfully do various teaching-learning situations reflect the philosophy and intents of the Master Plan? (2) How effective is the new program in terms of its impact upon student learning? Are desired outcomes, in fact, being achieved in the classroom? (3) What constraints have stood (or still stand) in the way of effective implementation of the program in the schools of the Province.

For each of these questions we have a number of indicators which allow us to arrive at summary conclusions.

1. *Fidelity of the Classroom Situation with the Master Plan.* As a measure of fidelity with the Master Plan, we selected five indicators: (1) the valuing and inquiry orientation; (2) the D.A.P. orientation; (3) the use of "unstructured time"; (4) the level of student involvement in planning; and (5) the scope of teaching-learning activities.

The Valuing-Inquiry Orientation. Although about 80% of our respondents appear to believe that the valuing orientation, controversial issues, challenges to society, and active involvement in society *should be* the hallmark of Social Studies education, fewer than 50% report that corresponding activities *do*, in fact, take place in their classrooms; hence, it would appear that the discrepancy between what most teachers perceive to be the ideal and what they perceive to be as the real is very large indeed.

Also, it must be noted that many teachers reject the valuing orientation (32%); even more reject the non-textbook approach and the notion of open student inquiry (40%). Not surprisingly, the lecture, note-taking, and testing for the recall of facts remain the dominant activities in such classrooms.

In a very small proportion of the classrooms (fewer than 20%), have the valuing and inquiry orientations become the pervasive orientations they were intended to become. In these few situations, highly committed and imaginative teachers have succeeded in preserving the integrity of the program and adapting it to their students' needs and interests -- with the result that truly exciting environments for inquiry, for critical analyses, and for valuing have been created.

The D.A.P. Orientation. It was the intent of the Master Plan that, in dealing with value issues, appropriate emphases would be given to the processes of designation, appraisal and prescription. We have found that the designative aspects of the process are dominant, almost to the exclusion of the other two, in a large majority (over 80%) of real classroom situations; that the appraisive aspects of the process receive attention in only about 20% of the situations; and that the prescriptive aspects receive attention in very few, if any.

The Use of Unstructured Time. Our evidence on the use of the so-called "unstructured time" portion of the program appears to be somewhat conflicting. About 75% of the teachers indicate that students should be involved in deciding what to do with the unstructured time -- but less than 50% claim that students are so involved. Also, though 65% believe that records should be kept of the problems studied by students, only 40% claim to keep such records.

A full 25% of the students, however, claim not even to know about the one-third unstructured time -- and many of those who do know about it refer to it as a "myth". They allege that they are only minimally involved in planning the use of this time, and claim that their inputs to the planning process are used only if they coincide with the teacher's interests and intents.

Level of Student Involvement in Planning. Though about 85% of teachers believe that students *should be* involved in selecting issues for analysis, only 50% *do*, in fact, claim to involve students in this activity. Only 35% of the students, however, believe that they are so involved.

Similarly, while 74% of the teachers believe that ample opportunities are provided "for the exploration of student feelings", only 45% of the students agree. And while 71% of the teachers claim that "behavior is examined from many points of view", only 49% of the students think so.

In summary, there appear to be two fairly large discrepancies here: one, of the order of 35%, between the extent to which teachers believe students should be involved in planning and the extent to which teachers believe students are involved; and the other, of approximately 25%, between what teachers perceive the situation to be and what students perceive it to be.

The Repertoire of Activities. The new Social Studies program virtually mandates that teachers and students engage in a wide variety of teacher-learner activities -- independent inquiry, group discussion, role playing, simulation, community analysis, and so on, depending upon the substance and the object of the learning experience.

We have found that, in what might be called "traditional classrooms", the lecture and note-taking are still standard fare. In classrooms in which the newer orientations have been adopted, the individual student research report has become the major activity -- to the virtual exclusion of all other strategies.

Hence, it may be said that a very limited repertoire of learning activities pervades the Social Studies classrooms of the Province.

In light of all of the foregoing indicators, we conclude: that the new program is operative at some minimal level of fidelity with the Master Plan in

virtually all schools and classrooms; that it is operative at about 50% level of fidelity in the typical classroom; and that it is operative at a considerably higher but by no means perfect, level of fidelity in but a few classrooms.

2. *Learner Outcomes: The Final Measure of Quality.* At the outset, we must acknowledge that we do not have the kind of data (before and after measures of student behavior) which would enable us to make unequivocal statements about the impacts of the new program.

What data we have are in the form of student opinions and parent opinions. And even these must be interpreted with great caution for the reason noted at several points in this report -- namely, that the new program has been implemented at various levels of authenticity and, hence, that different students may be reporting on significantly different programs. However, the following seem noteworthy.

Impacts of the Program on Students. Students' views differed, as one would suspect, regarding the ultimate impact the Social Studies were having upon them as persons. From our questionnaire survey, for example, we gleaned that just over half (52%) believe that Social Studies classes do, in fact, help them to arrive at solutions to social problems; that, similarly, just over half (51%) believe that the Social Studies do, in fact, help them to reassess their attitudes, beliefs and values; but that only 37% believe that they are provided with "real" opportunities to act out their value choices and learn the consequences; and that still fewer (13%) believe that experiences in Social Studies do cause them to change their behavior in daily life.

Perceptual Difficulties. Earlier in this report, we noted a very wide discrepancy between teachers' perceptions of *what ought to be* and *what is* in Social Studies education. In general, students' opinions support these discrepancies admitted by teachers. But there are also some significant discrepancies between

teachers' and students' views of *what is*. For example, while 74% of the teachers reported that in their classrooms ample opportunities are provided for the "exploration of students feelings", only 45% of our student respondents agreed. Similarly, while 71% of the teachers claimed that "behavior is examined from many points of view", only 49% of the students agreed.

Such discrepancies seem to suggest that, even though teachers intend to provide certain opportunities and experiences for students, students often do not realize (or believe) such experiences are being provided.

Similarly, many, many students believe that they are not allowed sufficient involvement in program planning. Even the so-called one-third unstructured time, they allege, is almost totally planned by teachers. As a result, students claim to be unaware of the objectives of many activities and, hence, to profit less than they ought to.

Finally, the students we interviewed tended to corroborate our judgments (from the questionnaire and teacher interviews) that authenticity in program implementation and effectiveness varies from classroom to classroom. One student had developed a formula which he expressed somewhat as follows: "In any three years, the Junior High or the Senior High years, a student is likely to get one year of boring lectures, note-taking, memorization, and tests; one year of pointless, unguided student projects; and one year of really exciting experiences -- with the teacher playing an important role but allowing the student to participate fully. That one year makes it all worthwhile."

Other students agreed with this general diagnosis. And they concluded simply: *It all depends on the teacher.*

In summary, it must be recognized that the evidence on the impacts of the new program on students is very sketchy. Clearly, however, most students do not believe the program is having a major impact. Furthermore, they claim not to be

in tune with many of their teachers about the major orientations, strategies, and intended outcomes of the program.

3. *Encouragements and Constraints.* Why has the program not been more evenly installed in the classrooms throughout the Province. What constraints have stood, or still stand, in the way of effective implementation?

There appear to be at least five partial answers to this question: (1) a tendency to dichotomize the various positions in the philosophical and pedagogical belief structure underlying the Social Studies; (2) the availability or non-availability of resources; (3) the presence or non-presence of encouragement, support and consultative assistance; (4) the demands of the program development task; and (5) basic teacher qualification.

Dichotomization. Perhaps nowhere in education is the tendency to dichotomize positions and beliefs as great as it is in the Social Studies. Many teachers believe that one engages either in valuing or in the acquisition of knowledge -- but not both; either in interdisciplinary studies or in rigorous inquiry -- but not both; either in discovery-oriented activities or in learning -- but not both; and so on. The dichotomies are endless. As a result, many teachers believe they must be willing to sacrifice the socially and personally maturing experiences of valuing, critical analyses, and social activism, if they are to provide a "solid" education. Conversely, other teachers believe they must be willing to sacrifice skills and knowledge, if they are to allow students to engage in inquiry, in valuing, and in what they perceive as "random" student activities.

Too few teachers (and students) are able to "get everything together" into a legitimate and consistent pattern of Social Studies education. Too many tend to incline too far in one direction or the other -- toward free and open student inquiry, without the appropriate knowledge and skills or toward the mastery of facts,

without experience in inquiry, in valuing, or in critical analysis and involvement. No doubt this tendency to disagree on the basic belief structure of the new program is an important factor in its pattern of implementation.

Resources. Though some schools are now developing or acquiring fairly rich resources in the Social Studies, most teachers are still mindful of the early days of the program when appropriate resources simply were not available. Indeed, in some schools materials are still either inappropriate or in very short supply.

Not surprisingly, many teachers and students believe that a return to a standard, prescribed textbook is the only solution to the problem.

Clearly, the new program is very dependent for its success upon a variety of learning materials of many forms. Unless such materials are available, the program will flounder -- as it has. This unevenness in resources appears to us to be another major factor in the pattern of program implementation.

Support and Encouragement. Teachers report that the support, encouragement and assistance they have received has been minimal and varied. Though most teachers (over 60%) considered the Department of Education to be most helpful in orienting them to the new program, and though many teachers (over 55%) from the large urban centres reported that district-wide services were and are provided, in the final analysis, teachers viewed each other as the best source of assistance and encouragement.

Over 50% of the teachers did not view their principals or teacher organization as helpful or encouraging.

Again, it seems clear that patterns of assistance and encouragement influenced patterns of implementation. In larger situations, where teachers could turn to each other and/or to district services, implementation tended to proceed. In other situations, where both collegial support and consultative services were

minimal or non-existent, teachers tended (and still do tend) to revert to what they know best -- the teaching of traditional Social Studies.

The Burden of Program Development. Very few teachers (19%) reported that they were provided with time for planning and program development. This, coupled with the scarcity of resources noted above, no doubt still impedes program implementation.

Teacher Qualifications. Approximately 50% of our teacher respondents reported that they held university degrees in history, geography or the social sciences. This is not surprising since slightly over half (52%) of our respondents were Elementary teachers and might well be expected to have majored in language arts, early childhood education, or whatever. [However, 14% reported majors in English or physical education.]

The point is this: there are many teachers struggling with the new program who, for whatever reason, are basically unprepared to deal with it. [We interviewed some High School Social Studies teachers, for example, who had majored in fields unrelated to the Social Studies and found them to be quite uncomprehending of the major themes of the program. To these teachers, such notions as inquiry, valuing, critical analyses, and so on are little more than slogans; when attempts are made to implement empty slogans, the results are as often miseducative as they are educative.]

We conclude that basic teacher preparation (and deployment) is another critical factor in the implementation, non-implementation, or mis-implementation of the new program.

Parental Knowledge and Involvement. The architects of the new Social Studies program anticipated active involvement in planning by parents and the community. This involvement simply has not developed. Indeed, very few parents are even knowledgeable about the program. If any are involved in planning, we were not made aware of them. Very likely, this lack of community knowledge, involvement and support has been a further reason that the program has not gained the momentum anticipated.

IV. SUMMARY JUDGMENTS

Some of the foregoing findings and conclusions were formulated upon fairly concise and quantifiable data. Others, however, were synthesized from observations and impressionistic evidence.

The task now is to move from these various sets of data and indicators to our final set of judgments or evaluations. These are summarized in the Profile on the next page.

It will be seen that attainments vary markedly, in our judgment, among the various dimensions of the Profile. For example, we have judged the Master Plan to be excellent in its orientations and fidelity with the goals of education, but somewhat lacking in its utility. Similarly, the programs were judged to be reasonably faithful to the Master Plan in the expressed value concepts and skills, but much less faithful in the treatment of values and skills.

A PROFILE: THE STATUS OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES 1975

A. The Master Plan

1. Fidelity with Goals of Education
2. Appropriateness of Orientation
3. Level of Internal Consistency
4. Level of Teacher Awareness
5. Level of Teacher Familiarity
6. Acceptability: to teachers
   to students
   to parents
7. Perceived Utility to Teachers

B. Program Development

1. Fidelity with Master Plan
   (a) in value concepts
   (b) in concept treatment
   (c) in D.A.P. orientation
   (d) in skills
2. Adequacy of Time
3. Adequacy of Support
   (a) from the Department
   (b) from the District
   (c) from the University
   (d) from Associations
4. Level of Formative Evaluation
5. Extent of Regional Equality
6. Adequacy of Canadian Content

C. The School/Classroom Situation

1. Fidelity with the Master Plan
   (a) in the valuing orientation
   (b) in the D.A.P. orientation
   (c) in the use of unstructured time
   (d) in level of student involvement
   (e) in scope of activities
2. Impacts Upon Learners
   (a) in problem solving
   (b) in reassessing beliefs
   (c) in deciding behavior
   (d) in forming life styles
3. Level of perceptual agreement between teacher and student
4. Adequacy of resources
5. Level of support & encouragement
6. Adequacy of planning time
7. Level of teacher qualifications
8. Level of parental involvement

Clearly, this is a mixed report card. In the very complicated processes of innovation -- of clarifying the grand idea, of communicating that idea to practitioners, of translating it into programs, and of installing these programs in classrooms -- there has been a great deal of "slippage".

Some of the causes of the slippage that has occurred are now not difficult to identify:

i. From the outset, there has not been a high degree of consensus on the basic philosophy, the orientations, or the objectives of the new program.

ii. Also, from the outset, there has been a serious shortage of support and resources of all types -- moral support and encouragement, guidance, consultation, instructional materials, and planning time.

iii. Many teachers, because of their inadequate or obsolete preparation and/or mis-placement, simply are not able to cope effectively with the demands of the new program.

iv. A wide-spread failure of schools to involve their communities in the planning and implementation of the program has effectively excluded the community as a source of encouragement and impetus.

v. Finally, the fact that teachers have declined to "take students into their confidence" (or to put it another way, have not "effectively recruited students" to the orientations, the objectives and the strategies of the new program) has resulted in dysfunctional gaps between teachers' and students' perceptions as to what the new program is or should be all about.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

We were asked to take stock of a particular program innovation at a particular point in time in its evolution. We were asked to judge that innovation -- on the basis of its appropriateness, the extent of its implementation, and its effectiveness. And we were asked to recommend on its future.

In general we have judged the Master Plan of the program to be appropriate -- but in need of refinement. We have judged the implementation of the program to have been difficult, slow and spotty -- and, hence, in need of further impetus. And we have judged the effectiveness of the program to be not only spotty, corresponding to the uneven pattern of implementation, but also considerably short of expectations even in situations where the program has been reasonably well installed.

These judgments may appear harsh. They may be interpreted by some readers as good and sufficient reasons (if they are indeed valid) to call for a retreat from the new program. We would disagree. The history of innovation is replete with "mixed report cards" -- uneven patterns of acceptance, uneven patterns of implementation, and uneven patterns of effectiveness.

Yet we are convinced that, after a five-year trial period, the program, as it operates in some situations, has demonstrated that it has an exciting potential. How is this potential to be realized?

A. RECOMMENDATIONS RE. THE MASTER PLAN

We have judged the Master Plan to be appropriate in its broad goals and its general orientation. We have further concluded that it has the potential to generate exciting and appropriate programs. Hence, our first recommendation is:

#1.	That the new Social Studies program be continued -- with certain refinements, to be noted later.

We have also noted, however, that the Master Plan suffers from some rather serious internal inconsistencies and is further weakened through lack of

teacher familiarity, understanding and acceptance. We recommend:

#2. That the Department of Education undertake a reassessment of the Master Plan and a thoroughgoing revision of the major documents in which the Master Plan is articulated. As a minimum, the revised documents should:

i. clarify and expand the specific orientations and illustrate how these may be subsumed in the various themes and topics;

ii. clarify provisions for student (and/or community) inputs to the goals and content both of the general program and of the "unstructured time";

iii. distribute Canadian content more evenly across the grades;

iv. reexamine the theory of "expanding horizons" as it applies to the themes and materials of the program;

v. express the messages of the Master Plan in language comprehensible to all teachers -- specialist or non-specialist.

The reassessment and revision that we suggest in #1 above will undoubtedly prove to be an onerous and difficult task. For attitudes toward the Master Plan are mixed; philosophies are entrenched; and experiences have been varied. Hence, as a matter of strategy, we suggest:

#3. That all relevant groups (Department of Education, Local School Authorities, the Teachers' Association, Faculties of Education, Students, Parents, and Citizens) be invited to participate in the reassessment and revision of the Master Plan; and

That some appropriate instrument such as an ad hoc Task Force be created for the conduct of the task.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS RE. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

We have further noted that, although the architects of the new program hoped and assumed that program development would proceed at a vigorous pace at the local level, little was done to ensure that such would be the case. As a result,

the activity has been spotty and of mixed quality. We believe the activity should now be given a new impetus and a new turn toward quality. Hence, we recommend:

#4. That the Department of Education create (or cause to be created) new instruments or agencies for the promotion and refinement of program development;

That these instruments (agencies) be allowed and encouraged to take on various forms -- depending upon size of local region, extent of local resources, etc.;

That these agencies assume six major functions:

i. to design model programs,
ii. to serve as demonstration centres,
iii. to train consultants and programers,
iv. to develop prototype materials,
v. to give leadership in formative evaluations,
vi. to serve as a clearing-house/communication centre; and

That care be taken that these agencies remain "service oriented" (i.e. provide incentives, expertise, support, etc.) and not develop into a new level of bureaucracy.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS RE. THE SCHOOL/CLASSROOM SITUATION

We have noted that many teachers, when confronted with the new program, tended to react in one of two ways: either by remaining uncharged -- and continuing to function as the directors of learning, the transmitters of knowledge, and the evaluators of student progress; or by changing completely -- and moving from directors to observers, from participants to spectators, from the foreground to the background of the learning situation.

[One observer described the latter tendency in a parody on a familiar song: "Where have all the teachers gone?"]

We believe that the undirected student report is not a particularly appropriate alternative to teacher domination of the learning environment. Indeed, we recommend:

#5. That teachers and consultants be encouraged to strive to achieve a broader repertoire and a better balance of both teacher and student activities in the classroom;

That the purpose of the activity (be it interest-generating, question-clarification, information-gathering, data-analysis, conclusion-drawing, judgment and/or valuing) be used as the basis for establishing the role and function of the teacher at any particular point in time; and

That teachers participate actively in all types of classroom activities to monitor and guide inquiries, to ensure that the various orientations and purposes of the program (concept development, skill development, value inquiries, the D.A.P. balance, and so on) get meaningfully incorporated into learning activities.

D. MISCELLANEOUS SUGGESTIONS

1. As indicated, there appears to be a rather wide-spread belief among students, teachers and parents (along with such agencies as The Committee for an Independent Canada) that *Canadian content* ought to be increased in the Social Studies and distributed more evenly across the grades.

We do not quarrel with that belief; it is surely reasonable to hold that Canadian citizens should have some grasp of the historical, geographical, cultural and social bases of their homeland.

But we have noted that in some circles (both within and outside the classroom) this renewed emphasis upon Canadiana has taken on a highly nationalistic, chauvinistic quality. Also there is a new demand for a kind of encyclopedic knowledge of Canada's history and geography. These turns are completely incompatible with the expressed goals of education and with the fundamental orientations of the Social Studies program. Hence, we suggest:

#6.

That teachers and program-developers exercise appropriate caution as they move toward increased Canadiana in the curriculum.

That Canadian content be used, appropriately, as the vehicle for many inquiries, as the starting point for others, and as the reference point for others; but

That the desire for more Canadian content not be allowed to become the excuse for subverting some of the other important goals of the program.

2. We have observed that patterns of *student involvement* in Social Studies planning are mixed. In some cases, students are in no way involved; in others, they are involved quite superficially; and in still others, they are allowed to "take over" certain portions of the program, turn it in the direction of their current whims and interests, and deal with it as they see fit.

We believe that no one of these patterns is entirely appropriate. Students should not be excluded from planning. But neither should they be included in a superficial or patronizing manner. Nor should they be allowed to plan and conduct their activities without teacher guidance. Instead, students should become partners in the planning process and one of the goals of the endeavor should be to make them become skillful and committed through the experience. Specifically, we suggest:

#7.

That deliberate attempts be made to familiarize students with the aims, the orientations and the methodologies of the Social Studies program;

That students be deeply involved in the processes of clarifying goals, of planning activities, and of assessing progress; and

That, through these and other means, a commonality of perception be sought between student and teacher.

3. The new program is touted as one in which the student develops an interest and a skill "in making the world a better place in which to live". Yet, we have found that, in very few instances is there any real or meaningful contact between the Social Studies classroom and the "world out there". Parents and community groups are totally uninformed about the Social Studies program; they are in no way involved in planning it; and they make little or no contribution to its implementation. We suggest:

#8. That some kind of communication device(s) be initiated, either at the Provincial or local level -- or both -- to inform the public of the purposes, orientations, and strategies of the program;

That deliberate attempts be made to involve parents and society in planning; and

That community resources be used maximally in Social Studies education.

4. Finally, we have noted a wide variation in the competencies that various teachers bring to the task of implementing the new program. Some are steeped in the traditions of the past and have difficulty either accepting the new orientations and/or implementing them effectively. Others are generalists (or trained in another subject field) and have difficulty coping with the materials and the modes of the Social Studies.

We think the rather wide-spread belief that "anyone can teach Social Studies" is totally wrong and does nothing but damage to the program -- not to mention the students involved. Hence, we suggest:

#9. That School Authorities exercise caution in their hiring and deploying practices -- to ensure that teachers are qualified for the tasks assigned;

That enlightened programs of in-service education be initiated cooperatively by Local Authorities, the Association, the Universities, and the Department to engage practicing teachers in self-development through: short courses, involvement in projects or program development, visitation programs, and so on; and

That special consultative and information services be provided for non-specialists -- particularly Elementary teachers.

A CONCLUDING THOUGHT

Throughout this inquiry, one very troublesome issue has returned to us over and over again. This is the matter of *teacher selection.*

It now appears abundantly clear to us that no depth of scholarship, no technical excellence, no classroom expertise will serve the needs of the new Social Studies program unless the personality and the disposition of the teacher are supportive of its intents.

About one-third of our teachers reject the inquiry and valuing orientations, and less than one-fifth actively promote them. Effective programs of teacher education may do much to change these ratios. It is clear, however, that many candidates for teacher education enter professional programs with attitudes and philosophies and convictions (variously derived from the home, the church, or the community) which are partly or wholly antagonistic to student prerogatives of open inquiry and valuing. In many cases these characteristics are so firmly ingrained that no amount of study (disciplinary or interdisciplinary) and no amount

of liberalizing experience (professional or other) will dispose them towards other than establishment kinds of thinking and acting in the classroom.

Is this not a kind of sabotage?

We now require from all teacher-education candidates indications of academic potential comparable to that for other kinds of professional education. Should we not also require from them (especially those who, like Social Studies teachers, will be dealing in areas of social alternatives) indications of intellectual flexibility and openness -- together with the disposition to encourage these characteristics in others?

Given the fact of our pluralistic society and a Social Studies program that purports to accommodate a plurality of positions and values, is it reasonable to leave the implementation of that program in the hands of teachers who, themselves, cannot tolerate pluralism?